

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

JAVIER LUIS,	:	Case No. 1:12-cv-629
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Susan J. Dlott
	:	
v.	:	ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND
	:	RECOMMENDATION
JOSEPH ZANG, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Objections (docs. 226 and 227) to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 225) that Defendant Awareness Technologies, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 213) should be granted. In addition, Plaintiff has filed several Motions for Leave to File Amended Objections and for Extensions (docs. 228, 230, 232, 233, and 234). Finally, an Objection to a Magistrate Judge's Order/Motion for Reconsideration (doc. 190) was improperly filed on February 6, 2017, but remains pending.

This matter has a very lengthy procedural history summarized effectively in the Magistrate Judge's well-written Report and Recommendation. Defendant Awareness Technologies is the only defendant remaining in this matter.

As Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, the Court has reviewed every objection Plaintiff filed, even those that were filed after time expired, those that failed to make specific objections as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a)(2), and those that exceeded the maximum page limitation and/or failed to comply with the Court's Standing Orders and Local Civil Rule 7.2(a)(3).¹ Specifically, the Court reviewed and considered the arguments contained in


¹ Exhibit 2 to Document 222 (Plaintiff's Proposed Surreply) alone is nearly 400 pages long.

documents 222, 226, 227, 228, 230, 232, 233, and 234, and the attachments thereto as part of its *de novo* review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b)(3).

While the Court found much of this information interesting, nothing contained in these documents persuades the Court that the Magistrate Judge's Report should be modified or its recommended disposition should be altered. Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 225) is hereby adopted as the opinion of this Court. Defendant Awareness Technologies' Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 213) is hereby **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's Objections (docs. 226 and 227) are hereby overruled. Plaintiff's remaining motions (docs. 190, 228, 230, 232, 233, and 234) are hereby **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 7, 2018



Judge Susan J. Dlott
United States District Court